

The Marlowe Canon

BY

TUCKER BROOKE



1922



3 3333 05852 3487

822-M-B
 BROOKE
 MARLOWE CANON
 4.95 + BNG F

Drama

MY

	DYUX	216432	

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
 AT
 LINCOLN CENTER

111 Amsterdam Avenue
 New York, N. Y. 10023

MY

Books circulate for four weeks (28 days) unless stamped "1 week" or "2 weeks."

No renewals are allowed.

A fine will be charged for each overdue book at the rate of 10 cents per calendar day for adult books and 5 cents per calendar day for children's books.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
Modern Language Association
of America

VOL. XXXVII, 3

SEPTEMBER, 1922

XIX. THE MARLOWE CANON

I. AUTHENTIC WORKS

A. PLAYS

Christopher Marlowe's name appears on the title-pages of the early editions of the following plays:

Dido: 'Written by Christopher Marlowe, and Thomas Nash. Gent.' (1594)

Edward the Second: 'Written by Chri. Marlow Gent.' (1594)

The Massacre at Paris: 'Written by Christopher Marlow.' (n. d. ca. 1600.)

Doctor Faustus: 'Written by Ch. Marl.' (1604)

The Jew of Malta: 'Written by CHRISTOPHER MARLO.' (1633)

Lust's Dominion: 'Written by Christofer Marloe, Gent.' (1657)

The last drama is probably falsely ascribed: the evidence will be taken up in the discussion of the spurious works. The remaining plays appear indeed to be chiefly or altogether Marlowe's work; and to these should be added on internal evidence four plays published anonymously, concerning which no satisfactory external evidence of authorship exists:

Tamburlaine, first and second parts (1590)

The First Part of the Contention between York and Lancaster (1594)¹

The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York (1595)¹

1. *Dido, Queen of Carthage*

There is some reason to believe that *The Tragedy of Dido, Queen of Carthage* may have been Marlowe's first essay at dramatic composition. The recorded history of the play, however, does not go back of the year 1594, in which the only early edition appeared. The phraseology of the title-page, 'Played by the Children of her Maiesties Chappell,' rather implies that performances were still being given at the time of publication;² and the failure of any licensing notice in the Stationers' Register is perhaps due to the publisher Woodcock's inability to secure a clear right to print while the drama was still a novelty on the stage.³ Evidently the text was printed from a theatre manuscript. This is indicated by the list of 'Actors' on the title-page, and by the explicit nature of the stage directions.

The most acceptable hypothesis is perhaps that Marlowe wrote the play while still at college, and that Nashe, acting as a (presumably self-appointed) literary executor, revised

¹ The authorship of the Henry VI plays is not specifically discussed in this article. The present writer's belief that Marlowe was the main author of the *First Part of the Contention* and the *True Tragedy* and that he was not at all concerned in the *First Part of Henry VI* has been stated elsewhere. Cf. *The Authorship of the Second and Third Parts of "King Henry VI"* (Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1912) and the Yale Shakespeare edition of *The First Part of King Henry VI* (1918), Appendix C.

² Contrast the specific use of the past tense on the title-pages of other plays:—'two Tragical Discourses, as they were sundrie times shewed vpon Stages in the Citie of London' (*Tamburlaine*, 1590); 'As it was sundrie times publicly acted' (*Edward II*, 1594); 'As it hath bene Acted' (*Doctor Faustus*, 1604).

³ Thomas Woodcock was an under warden of the Stationers' Co. from July 1593. As he died, April 22, 1594, it would appear that the 1594 quarto must have been published between that date and the twenty-fourth of the previous month, when the old year ended by the stationers' calendar. On March 4, 1593-4 Woodcock entered a book called *A Myrrour of Popishe subtilties*.

the manuscript after Marlowe's death for the use of the particular London company which might most properly undertake the production of so academic a piece.⁴ This is the apparent meaning of Bishop Tanner when he says of the play: 'Hanc perfecit et edidit Tho. Nash.'⁵ Such is the opinion of Warton,⁶ Broughton,⁷ Dyce, Ellis,⁸ Ward,⁹ Faligan, Creizenach, Knutowski, Ingram, Bullen,¹⁰ Sir Sidney Lee,¹¹ Charles Crawford,¹² and McKerrow.¹³

⁴ Nashe's *Summer's Last Will* was similarly designed for private performance, though by what company is not known. McKerrow shows good reason to believe that it was composed for production in 1592 at Archbishop Whitgift's palace at Croydon, and actually given there, after revision, on the occasion of the Queen's visit in August, 1600 (*Nashe* iv. 416 ff.).

⁵ *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, 1748, p. 512.

⁶ 'His Tragedy of Dido Queen of Carthage was completed and published by his friend Thomas Nashe in 1594.' Regarding the elegiac song on Marlowe's death by Nashe, which both Tanner and Warton profess to have seen in a copy of *Dido*, nothing further is known. All that can be said on this perplexing subject has been well said by Dyce and McKerrow.

⁷ *Gentleman's Magazine*, April, 1830. Broughton suspects 'that Nash merely prepared it for the press after Marlowe's death, or at the utmost completed two or three scenes, which perhaps were left unfinished.'

⁸ 'It is probably an early work of Marlowe's, so far as it is his at all, and it must have been elaborated and considerably enlarged by Nash in a manner that is sometimes a caricature, perhaps not quite unconsciously, of Marlowe's manner. *Dido* must be compared to *Hero and Leander* rather than to any of Marlowe's dramas.' (Mermaid ed, xliii).

⁹ 'I am inclined to think that so far as *Dido* was written by Marlowe, it must be regarded as a juvenile work, very probably composed before he left Cambridge. . . . It is impossible to determine how much of this tragedy is Marlowe's, although it is tolerably easy to lay one's finger on what must be Nashe's.'

¹⁰ 'Nashe's work lay chiefly in completing certain scenes which Marlowe had sketched in the rough.'

¹¹ 'The piece must have been a very juvenile effort, awkwardly revised and completed by Nashe after Marlowe's death.' (*D. N. B.*, Marlowe). In the article on Nashe, Lee says: 'In 1594 he completed and saw through the press Marlowe's unfinished "Tragedie of Dido." Nash's contribution to the work is bald, and lacks true dramatic quality.'

¹² 'Although Marlowe left *Dido* unfinished at his death, it is pretty safe to say that his friend Thomas Nashe, who completed it, added but little to the play.' (*Collectanea* i. 91.)

¹³ 'It seems to me to be practically all Marlowe's.' (Private letter, 1909.)

The idea that Marlowe and Nashe wrote the play in conjunction has been seriously advanced only by Collier,¹⁴ Fleay,¹⁵ and W. Wagner;¹⁶ the still less reasonable view that it is chiefly the work of Nashe only by the publisher of the Hurst edition of 1825 (who adduces no arguments) and by Grosart in a very ill-argued passage in his *Complete Works of Nashe*.¹⁷

That *Dido* was originally a quasi-academic exercise, intended for a university rather than a London public, is suggested

¹⁴ 'It is chiefly the circumstance of the monotony of Nash's versification which enables us to judge what parts of the tragedy of *Dido* proceeded from his pen, and what other parts from that of his coadjutor Marlow' (*Hist. Engl. Dr. Poet.* iii. 225). Collier ascribes to Nashe the description of the taking and sack of Troy; to Marlowe the 'pretty scene in which Dido is wounded by Cupid in guise of Ascanius and one or two that follow it.' 'Although there is a marked superiority in the versification of some parts of the play over others', Collier adds, 'we may conclude with sufficient certainty that it was produced before Marlowe had himself acquired that degree of excellence in the formation of blank verse which he had attained when he produced his *Edward II.*' (p. 229.)

¹⁵ In his *Biographical Chronicle*, ii. 147, 148 (1891), Fleay asserts that *Dido* was written by Marlowe and Nashe at Cambridge, and thus partitions the authorship:—Marlowe—I.i.a, II.i.ii., III.iii., IV.iii.iv., V.i.ii.; Nashe—the rest. In the introduction to his edition of *Edward II* (1877) Fleay had accepted the more usual view: 'He (Marlowe) did leave an unfinished play, however, *Dido*. This got somehow into Nash's possession, who finished it for the Chapel Children.'

¹⁶ Wagner (*Sh.-Jb.* xi. 75) calls *Dido* 'eine sehr durchdachte und sorgfältig ausgeführte Arbeit, in der Marlowe offenbar seinen jüngern Genossen, Nash, Alles ausführen liess, was zur bloss äusserlichen Fortführung der Handlung gehörte, während er selbst den Gesamtplan und die grossen, pathetischen Scenen lieferte.'

¹⁷ 'Broadly, I would state that the "vocabulary" and phrasing of Nashe are so marked in this "Tragedie"—as our Glossarial-Index demonstrates—and that of Marlowe is so slightly illustrated, that in my judgment very little of it was left by Marlowe for Nashe. His "mighty line" is scarcely once found; not even his choice epithets except in a very few cases, and even these few so mixed up with Nashe's self-evidencing *bits* as to be doubtful: *e.g.*, one might have set down a passage in "*Dido*" as almost certainly Marlowe's, but in it occurs a so singularly used Nashe word as to certify it to have been his. See Glossarial-Index under "Attract." And so throughout.' (Vol. vi. p. xxii.)

by the large number of Latin lines which the extant text retains. The evidence of metre and style seems also to link it with Marlowe's earliest works.¹⁸

Crawford has noted the remarkable way in which lines

¹⁸ The large amount of alliteration and rime, and relatively small proportion of feminine endings, caesural pauses, and trochaic first feet are notable. The figures for different parts of this play as regards rime and final polysyllables perhaps offer some hints as to its authorship:

	Final polysyllables	Riming lines
L1. 1-100	5	12
101-200	6	8
201-300	4	6
301-400	15	4
401-500	18	5
501-600	8	2
601-700	12	6
701-800	13	4
801-900	5	2
901-1000	3	7
1001-1100	5	6
1101-1200	5	8
1201-1300	10	4
1301-1400	7	4
1401-1500	8	8
1501-1600	12	6
1601-1700	11	4
1701-1736	1	4

The percentage of riming lines decreases pretty regularly as the percentage of final polysyllables increases. If we take the polysyllables as a mark of Marlowe's hand, the largest traces of that poet would seem to be in the scenes dealing with Dido's first meeting with Æneas and the tale of Troy's destruction (with a falling off in the latter portion—lines 500-600—which includes the story of Priam's death); and in the scenes portraying the development of Dido's love (ll. 600-800) and the final parting (ll. 1500 ff.). The passages specially lacking in final polysyllables are often noticeably unlike Marlowe; e.g., the Jupiter-Ganymede prologue, which has no dramatic purpose; the flat rendering of the opening of the Æneid (134-295); the altercation between Juno and Venus (811-910); the jealousy of Iarbas and scene at the cave (911-1094); and the episode of Iarbas and Anna (1095-1150). Perhaps, however, the unevenness may be due as much to youthful inability to sustain the high style as to divided authorship.

in *Dido* parallel lines in *Tamburlaine*.¹⁹ He mentions *Dido* 505 f.

Yet flung I forth, and desperate of my life,
Ran in the thickest throngs

and *Tamburlaine* 3329 f.

But then run desperate through the thickest throngs,
Dreadlesse of blowes, of bloody wounds and death;

Dido 1414

And clad her in a Chrystall liueric

and *Tamburlaine* 2573

And cloath it in a christall liueric.²⁰

To these should be added:

Dido 63 And all *Aolia* to be vp in armes

Tamb. 2397 All *Asia* is in Armes with *Tamburlaine*

“ 2401 All *Affrike* is in Armes with *Tamburlaine*

“ 4384 All *Turkie* is in armes with *Callapine*

Dido 155 f. Doe thou but smile, and cloudie heauen will cleare,
Whose night and day descendeth from thy browes

Tamb. 1220 That with thy looks canst cleare the darkened Sky

“ 2572 Whose chearful looks do cleare the cloudy aire

Dido 482 That after burnt the pride of *Asia*

Tamb. 140 Least you subdue the pride of Christendome

“ 3568 To ouerdare the pride of *Græcia*

Dido 765 f. Flinging in fauours of more soueraigne worth,
Then *Thetis* hangs about *Apolloes* necke

Tamb. 2737 f. The Sun vnable to sustaine the sight,
Shall hide his head in *Thetis* watery lap

¹⁹ ‘Often, when comparing Marlowe’s plays and poems with each other, I have been struck by the close manner in which *Dido* repeats *Tamburlaine*, and it has occurred to me that perhaps the author worked concurrently at the two dramas, and threw *Dido* aside to get on with other work. . . . *Dido* and *Tamburlaine* resemble one another in phrasing; and in both plays the phrasing is different from what we find in other parts of Marlowe’s work.’ (*Collectanea* i. 91 f.)

²⁰ Cf. also *Tamburlaine* 3462

Like louely *Thetis* in a Christall robe

- Dido* 830 That onely *Iuno* rules in *Rhamnuse* towne
Tamb. 635 When she that rules in *Rhamnis* golden gates
- Dido* 1070 Doubtles *Apollos* Axeltree is crackt
Tamb. 1494 That almost brent the Axeltree of heauen
 " 2415 Quiuer about the Axeltree of heauen
- Dido* 1150 And strewe thy walkes with my discheweld haire
Tamb. 1920 With haire discheweld wip'st thy watery cheeks
- Dido* 1251 Now lookes *Aeneas* like immortall *Ioue*
Tamb. 2292-4 As *Iuno*. . . .
 So lookes my Loue
- Dido* 1325 Nor blazing Commets threatens *Didos* death
Tamb. 1059 That shine as Comets, menacing reuenge
 " 4199 ff. Which threatned more than if the region. . . .
 Were full of Commets and of blazing stars²¹
- Dido* 1433 Whom doe I see, *Ioues* winged messenger?
Tamb. 2735 That *Ioue* shall send his winged Messenger²²

Parallels hardly less striking exist between *Dido* and later works of Marlowe; e.g.,

- Dido* 274 When suddenly gloomie *Orion* rose
DF 235 f. Now that the gloomy shadow of the earth,
 Longing to view *Orions* drisling looke
- Dido* 480-2 And after him a thousand Grecians more,
 In whose sterne faces shin'd the quenchles fire,
 That after burnt the pride of *Asia*
- DF* 1328 f. Was this the face that lancht a thousand shippes?
 And burnt the toplesse Towres of *Ilium*?
- Dido* 1328 f. For in his lookes I see eternitie,
 And heele make me immortall with a kisse
- DF* 1330 Sweete *Helen*, make me immortall with a kisse
- DF* 1333 Here wil I dwel, for heauen be in these lips
- Dido* 1416 ff. From golden *India Ganges* will I fetch,
 Whose wealthie streames may waite vpon her towers,
 And triple wise intrench her round about
- DF* 116 f. Ile haue them wall all *Iermany* with brasse,
 And make swift *Rhine* circle faire *Wertenberge*

²¹ Cf. also *Lucan* 527 And Commets that presage the fal of kingdoms.

²² Possibly it may be worth while to add the references to Deucalion (*Dido* 1465, *Tamb.* 2732 f.) and to 'blubbered cheeks' (*Dido* 1541, *Tamb.* 1802).

- Dido* 1554-6 So thou wouldst proue as true as *Paris* did,
Would, as faire *Troy* was, *Carthage* might be sackt,
And I be calde a second *Helena*
- DF* 1334-6 And all is drosse that is not *Helena*:
I wil be *Paris*, and for loue of thee,
Insteede of *Troy* shal *Wertenberge* be sackt
- Dido* 264 Forbids all hope to harbour neere our hearts
Edw. 2535 O if thou harborst murder in thy hart
- Dido* 725-7 And thou *Æneas*, *Didos* treasure,
In whose faire bosome I will locke more wealth,
Then twentie thousand Indiaes can affoord
- Edw.* 628 f. nor let me haue more wealth,
Then I may fetch from this ritche treasure
- Dido* 1305 ff. O that
Or that the Tyrrhen sea were in mine armes,
That he might suffer shipwracke on my breast
- Edw.* 1114 f. O that mine armes could close this Ile about,
That I might pull him to me where I would
- Dido* 1340 And let rich *Carthage* fleete vpon the seas
Edw. 344 This Ile shall fleete vpon the Ocean
- Dido* 1567 Tygers of *Hircania* gaue thee suck
Edw. 2057 Inhumaine creatures, nurst with *Tigers* milke
- Dido* 526 Threatning a thousand deaths at euerie glance
HL 382 Threatning a thousand deaths at euerie glance

It does not seem to me that the parallel passages prove anything definitely in regard to the date of *Dido*. The fact that the play has much more verbal affinity with the second than with the first part of *Tamburlaine* might be urged against the theory that *Dido* was Marlowe's first play. So might the similarities to such late works as *Edward II* and *Hero and Leander*; while it would seem most likely again that the three separate echoes of the great passage in *Faustus* (1328-1336) were written after that passage. It is easy to understand how Marlowe should in a subsequent play have repeated the ideas and wording of *Faustus*'s apostrophe to Helen; but not quite so easy to believe that when he created that apostrophe he was fusing together three ideas which he

had already expressed in *Dido* and which there bore no connection with each other.

Notwithstanding such considerations as these, the feeling remains that *Dido* is early work. But adherents of this theory are on safer ground when they trust to general evidence of style and spirit than when they attempt formal demonstration.²³

Evidence is also lacking on the relation between the Marlowe-Nashe tragedy and the play of *Dido and Æneas* which was first acted by Henslowe's company on January 8, 1597/8. I think it likely that the latter was a revised version of the former. Dyce has noted that the properties mentioned in the inventory of the Lord Admiral's Men ('j tome of Dido,' 'Cupides bowe, and quiver,' 'Item, Dides robe') 'do not bear out the identification.' Neither, however, do they invalidate it.

2. *Edward II*

Edward the Second was licensed for publication, July 6, 1593, and was printed in 1594—probably also in 1593—as 'Written by Chri. Marlow Gent.' and as 'sundrie times publicly acted . . . by . . . the Earle of Pembroke his seruants.'

With the exception of the *First Part of the Contention and True Tragedy*, and possibly of *Dido*,²⁴ this is the only play

²³ The following explanations of apparent marks of late composition of *Dido* may be mentioned:

1. The second part of *Tamburlaine* is much more loosely constructed than the first. It contains more padding and is imaginatively less intense. Therefore the poet's temptation to draw upon the stock of ideas stored up in previous works would naturally have been greater than in the first part.

2. The hypothesis, already suggested by Knutowski and others, that Marlowe subjected *Dido* to an incomplete revision toward the close of his life, at the time when he was interested in *Edward II* and *Hero and Leander*, would obviate some difficulties, but is not based upon much solid probability.

3. The lines in *Tamburlaine*, 3055 ff., show that Marlowe's imagination was playing with the ideas embodied in the apostrophe to Helen before he conceived the play of *Doctor Faustus*.

²⁴ On the assumption that the *Dido and Æneas* first played by Henslowe's company on January 8, 1598 was *not* the Marlowe-Nashe drama.

by Marlowe which is not mentioned in Henslowe's Diary. Consequently, no definite dates of performances are at hand. Indications of the date of production, however, as well as of the powerful impression which the tragedy created, can be obtained from the extraordinary number of echoes of lines in *Edward II* to be found in works by rival poets. The anonymous *Arden of Feversham*, licensed April 3, 1592, and printed the same year, contains six undoubted pilferings;²⁵ Kyd's *Soliman and Perseda*, licensed November 20, 1592, contains five;²⁶ and Peele's *Edward the First*, licensed October 8, 1593, four more.²⁷ Other echoes are found in *The Battle of Alcazar*, published in 1594;²⁸ Lodge's *Wounds of Civil War*, licensed May 24, 1594;²⁹ Nashe's *Summer's Last Will*,³⁰ and Peele's *Honour of the Garter*,³¹ for which Peele received payment, June 23, 1593.

This evidence indicates the latter part of 1591 and the year 1592 as the time of the play's production. The little that is known of the fortunes of Pembroke's Company points in the same direction. By the close of 1592 they were apparently high in favor: there is record of payment to them for performances at court on December 27, 1592 and January 6, 1593. By September, 1593, they were in the greatest financial distress.³² This distress probably accounts for the fact

²⁵ *Edward II*, lines 151, 832 f., 857, 1911 f., 2031, 2651. Crawford asserts that 'There are at least thirty passages in *Arden of Feversham* that were directly inspired by *Edward II*.'

²⁶ *Edward II*, lines 157, 162, 594 f., 1875, 2248 f.

²⁷ *Edward II*, lines 173 f., 1550, 1684 ff., 1964.

²⁸ No entry of this play has been found in the Stationers' Register. It has been rather doubtfully assumed that it was in existence in 1589 on the ground of an allusion to 'Tom Stukeley' in Peele's *Farewell to Norris and Drake*. Cf. *Edward II*, line 1956.

²⁹ Cf. *Edward II*, lines 2302-2304.

³⁰ Cf. *Edward II*, line 2522. Nashe's play was apparently written during the summer of 1592. Cf. McKerrow, *Nashe* iv. 416 ff.

³¹ See *Edward II*, line 2562.

³² See Henslowe's letter of September 28, 1593.

that William Jones was able to license *Edward II* for publication on July 6, 1593.³³

3. *The Massacre at Paris*

A performance of 'the tragedey of the gvyes (Guise),' noted by Henslowe as a new play, was given by Lord Strange's Men on January 30, 1593.³⁴ Ten further performances, by the Admiral's Company, occurred in the following year (1594), between June 19 and September 25. A revival probably took place in the late autumn of 1598, for William Birde (or Borne) borrowed of Henslowe twelve shillings on November 19 of that year 'to embroider his hat for the Guise,' and on November 27 twenty shillings more 'to buy a pair of silk stockings to play the Guise in.'³⁵ Again, from the third to the twenty-sixth of November, 1601, Henslowe expended an aggregate sum of £7. 14s. 6d. on properties needed for the play,³⁶ and on the following January 18 (1601/2) he paid Edward Alleyn £6 'for three books which were played,' of which the second was 'The Massacre of France.'

³³ In the circumstances of performance and publication *Edward II* seems to be associated with *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*, which was likewise acted by Pembroke's Men (printed 1595), and with *The First Part of the Contention Between York and Lancaster* (printed 1594). Warton's statement that *Edward II* was 'written in the year 1590' rests upon no ascertained authority.

³⁴ No more performances in this year were possible because of the plague.

³⁵ It is however possible, as Greg notes (*Henslowe's Diary* ii. 197), that these properties were used in connection with an extended work on the Civil Wars of France, in three parts and an Introduction, referred to by Henslowe between Sept. 29, 1598 and Jan. 20, 1598/9. The authors of this were Dekker and Drayton, who may have drawn upon Marlowe's tragedy.

³⁶ Webster is known to have written a play called *The Guise*, now lost. Collier sought to connect Webster with the 1601 revival on the strength of Henslowe's record of Nov. 3, which he read: 'Lent vnto Wm. Jube the 3 of Novembz 1601 to bye stamell cllathes for the gwisse—Webster . . . iiiii.' The name Webster, he says (*Hist Engl. Dr. Poet.*, 1832, ii. 101) 'sufficiently connects Webster with the performance, which we may conjecture was a new version of Marlowe's tragedy.' The word 'Webster,' however, is a modern forgery. Cf. Warner, *Dulwich Catalogue*, pp. xlii and 161, and Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*. See also Stoll, *John Webster*, 200-205.

In view of the very unsatisfactory state of the text, it is difficult to form conclusions regarding either the original date of composition of this play or the extent to which the surviving edition represents Marlowe's text. The assassination of Henri III, with which the piece closes, occurred on August 2, 1589; and the allusion in lines 1250, 1251,

whet thy sword on *Sextus* bones,
That it may keenly slice the Catholicks,

implies that Pope Sixtus V (d. Aug. 27, 1590) was already dead as well. On the other hand, parallel passages seem to indicate that this play was written earlier than the *Contention, True Tragedy*, and *Edward II*.³⁷ Hence it is hard to believe that it can have been composed immediately previous to Henslowe's first mention of it in 1593. There would seem, then, to be some reason for believing *The Massacre at Paris* to be Marlowe's earliest effort to write a history play in the strict sense, and for dating it 1590 or 1591.³⁸ On that assumption, Henslowe's mark 'ne,' applied to the performance on January 30, 1593, requires explanation.

The title habitually employed by Henslowe, *The Guise*, very likely represents that given the play by Marlowe, the change to the less appropriate *Massacre of France* or *Massacre at Paris* being doubtless introduced in later revivals, after public interest in the Duc de Guise had abated. The text is evidently printed from a theatre manuscript: the stage directions are the fullest and most interesting in Marlowe. The incoherence of plot and irregularity of much of the verse may be the result of theatrical cutting and manipulation.³⁹

³⁷ See discussion of this point in the paper on the *Authorship of the Second and Third Parts of Henry VI*, pp. 173, 174.

³⁸ Collier (*Hist. Engl. Dr. Poet.* iii. 132) thinks that *The Massacre at Paris* 'possibly, in point of date, preceded *Faustus*,' and that it certainly preceded *The Jew of Malta* (*ibid.* 135). The latter idea is denied by Dyce, p. xxiv, note ¶.

³⁹ Lines 1005, 1027 sound like reminiscences of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, II. ii. 10, 48, which was not in existence till half a dozen years after Marlowe's death. Mr. J. M. Robertson (*The Shakespeare Canon*, 1922) would give Marlowe a part in *Julius Caesar* and in *Henry V*.

4. *Doctor Faustus*

Marlowe's authorship of *Doctor Faustus*, indicated on the title-pages of the numerous quartos, has not been questioned. Doubt exists, however, on two points:—(1) the relation of the two texts of 1604 and 1616 to each other and to Marlowe's manuscript; and (2) the date of composition of the play.

The question of the relative merits of the two texts has, since Dyce first called attention to the serious differences between them, evoked enormous controversy, particularly in Germany. The following statements can now be supported, I think, by satisfactory evidence:

(1) The 1604 text, reprinted in the quartos of 1609 and 1611, represents the acting version of the play more or less as it existed when Thomas Bushell entered the manuscript for publication on January 7, 1600 (1601).

(2) The 1616 text, reprinted in 1619, 1620, 1624, 1628, and 1631, gives the acting version that resulted after Henslowe employed William Birde and Samuel Rowley, in 1602, to write additions to the play.⁴⁰

(3) Neither text represents the play as it left Marlowe's hands. The 1604 text is marred by cuts and by a few pieces of interpolated clownage presumably dating from a period subsequent to Marlowe's death—probably the period of the recorded performances of 1594–1597.

(4) The added matter in the 1616 text is almost entirely by Birde and Rowley; but this text preserves a few genuine lines omitted in the 1604 version, and in a greater number of cases enables the student to detect corruptions in that version. Evidence on these points is found in lines 351–432, 598–611, 612, 726 f., 797, 922–1006, 1106–1198, 1238–1242, 1273–1284 of the 1604 text.

⁴⁰ It may be surmised that the many deletions of references to the Deity, and similar expurgations, were made after King James's statute against profanity on the stage came into operation (1605). See P. Simpson, 'The 1604 Text of Marlowe's "Doctor Faustus"' (*English Association, Essays and Studies*, 1921, pp. 142–155.)

I am sceptical of the results of efforts to fix the date of composition of *Doctor Faustus*. Fleay dated the piece 1587-1588; nearly all other critics have assigned it to the following year, 1588-1589. Three arguments have been thought to prove a date prior to the close of 1589:

(1) Evidence of style and metre connects *Faustus* with *Tamburlaine*.⁴¹

(2) A 'ballad of the life and deathe of Doctor Faustus the great Cungerer,' licensed February 28, 1589 by Richard Jones, is assumed to have been suggested by the performance of the play.⁴²

(3) The company which is stated on the 1604 title-page to have acted the play (the Earl of Nottingham's) suspended its London performances at the command of the Lord Mayor on November 6, 1589.⁴³

One piece of evidence—far the most tangible which has been adduced—proves an embarrassment in fixing a date prior to November, 1589 for *Doctor Faustus*. This is the fact that Marlowe's undoubted source, the English translation of the *Faustbuch*, was printed in 1592. That Marlowe employed this work by 'P. F. Gent.' rather than the German original or any oral report of its contents is positively

⁴¹ Cf. Collier, *Hist. Engl. Dr. Poet.* iii. 126-130.

⁴² Collier's contention that the word *ballad* 'in the language of that time, might mean either the play or a metrical composition founded upon its chief incidents' (*ibid.* 126) seems to be entirely unjustified. It is supported neither by the evidence which he adduces nor by the N. E. D. Collier may have got the idea from Malone, who in his copy of the 1631 edition of *Faustus* noted the entry of the ballad and added: "This was probably the play; for R. Jones appears to have been Marlowe's Printer. See the preface to *Tamburlaine*."

⁴³ This company continued, however, to perform regularly at court till February 16, 1591 (cf. Greg, *Henslowe's Diary* ii. 83). Between 1591 and 1594 nothing is heard of it. Fleay assumes it to have spent these years abroad.

Allusions in the play to the Prince of Parma (d. 1592) and 'the fiery keele at *Antwarpes* bridge' (1585), and a very dubious reference to Thomas Cavendish's circumnavigation of the globe, July 21, 1586—Sept. 10, 1588, have no real value as determining the posterior limit for the date of the play.

demonstrated by numerous verbal parallels. There are two hypotheses on which the discrepancy in dates can be reconciled.

(1) It can be assumed that Marlowe had the use of P. F.'s manuscript several years in advance of its publication. This is an unlikely possibility.

(2) It can be assumed that there was an earlier edition of the translation, following very close upon the first appearance of the German Faustbuch in 1587. This is the assumption which recent critics have almost unanimously adopted; but it is based upon no extant evidence.⁴⁴ The words of the title-page of the 1592 Faustbook, 'Newly imprinted, and in convenient places imperfect matter amended,' have indeed been taken by Logeman and others to imply the existence of an earlier edition of P. F.'s translation. To this it must be said that the natural interpretation of 'Newly imprinted' is not reprinted, but recently or freshly printed, as in the statement of the first edition of *Tamburlaine*, 'Now *first* and *newlie* published'; and that the imperfect matter amended refers most likely to the very significant deviations which the translator made from his German original, not to variations between two English editions. Furthermore, the new matter which P. F. copiously introduces into the 1592 Faustbook is by no means what we should expect to find in a translation dashed off while the German Faustbuch was hot from the press; while the hypothesis of a normal translation about 1588, followed in 1592 by P. F.'s 'amended' version, would hardly help the case for the date of *Doctor Faustus*, since Marlowe clearly employed the peculiar P. F. version.

I am obliged to conclude that no reason exists for believing that P. F.'s translation of the Faustbuch of 1587 was in print before 1592, except the fact that Marlowe employed that version. The conventional date for Marlowe's play

⁴⁴ Collier (*Henslowe's Diary*, p. 42) states that the English Faustbook was entered for publication in 1588. Fleay suggests that the leaf containing this entry has since been abstracted; but misstatement on Collier's part seems considerably more likely.

(1588-1589), however, was fixed long before Logeman's reprint of the P. F. translation made it apparent that the poet employed that version rather than the German original; and critics from Logeman on have been so sure of that date that they have preferred to presume the necessity of an earlier edition of P. F. rather than reopen the question of the date of *Faustus*. Let us consider in the light of the new evidence the three arguments, already stated, which have been thought to demonstrate that the play was written before the close of 1589.

(1) Close similarities in style between *Tamburlaine* and *Faustus* certainly exist, just as there exist close similarities between *Faustus* and *Edward II*. The former indicate, I think, that *Faustus* followed *Tamburlaine*, but are not of a kind to prove that it followed it immediately.

(2) The ballad licensed on February 28, 1589 may reasonably be assumed to be the same in substance as the extant ballad in the Roxburghe collection;⁴⁵ but it would not be safe to argue that it was verbally the same and that any echo of Marlowe in the Roxburghe version must have existed in the earlier version of 1589 also. In point of fact, however, I believe Ellis (*Mermaid* Marlowe p. xxxvi, note), Logeman, and others to be right in asserting that the Roxburghe ballad was not founded on the play. It contains no suggestion of Marlowe's stage practice; does not mention *Me-phistophilis* or *Lucifer*, though speaking of 'the devil in fryars weeds;' and substitutes an hour glass for the dramatic striking of Marlowe's clock.⁴⁶

(3) The reference to the play on the title-page of 1604 as acted by the Earl of Nottingham's servants simply advertises the established fact that it had shortly before been acted by

⁴⁵ This is reprinted in an appendix to the *Mermaid* Marlowe. A slightly different version in the Bodleian (Wood 401) is collated by Logeman, p. 140.

⁴⁶ W. Wagner states well the relation between the ballad and the play: 'In spite of the coincidences we notice here, the ballad cannot be *derived* from the play. We should first notice that besides the discrepancies already pointed out there is a fundamental difference in the view taken of *Faustus's*

that company. A London company was so called only between October 22, 1597—when the Lord Admiral, Charles Howard, became Earl of Nottingham—and this same year 1604, when it passed under the patronage of Prince Henry.⁴⁷ By his allusion to the performances of Nottingham's Men I imagine that Bushell may have intended to imply mendaciously that his text was the same as that which Birde and Rowley had amplified for production by the Nottingham company at the close of 1602, and which was in 1604 undoubtedly the most familiar to playgoers. That any information concerning the original representation of the piece a dozen or fifteen years before is contained in Bushell's words seems absurd.

We know, indeed, that *Faustus* was performed from 1594 till 1597 by the Lord Admiral's Company, later called Nottingham's. *Tamburlaine* had been acted still earlier by the same company; and the publication of *Tamburlaine* in 1590 may have been connected with the inhibition of the Admiral's Men in November, 1589. If the company had been possessed of the manuscript of *Faustus* during this lean period, it would be logical to argue that that play also would have found its way into printers' hands. The part of *Faustus* appears to have been created by Edward Alleyn, and the

character. . . . We are, therefore, inclined to assume that the ballad was founded upon mere oral relation of the legend, such as might be obtained some way or other, perhaps from one of the inmates of the German "Steel-yard" in London' (p. xxvi).

I have observed just one passage in the ballad which sounds like Marlowe—where *Faustus* is made to say:

'I then did wish both sun and moon to stay,
All times and seasons never to decay.'

And this, curiously enough, is much more like the words of Edward II (2052 f.),

'Stand still you watches of the element,
All times and seasons rest you at a stay,'

than like the parallel lines of *Faustus* (1422 f.),

'Stand stil you euer moouing spheres of heauen,
That time may cease, and midnight neuer come.'

⁴⁷ Greg notes that *Marlowe's Diary* first speaks of the company as Nottingham's Men on May 26, 1599.

play—like *The Jew of Malta* which was performed by five different companies between 1592 and 1596—probably followed the individual fortunes of Alleyn rather than those of any particular company.

I conclude, then, that there is no good reason for assuming that *Doctor Faustus* was in existence prior to the publication of P. F.'s translation of the Faustbuch in 1592. Should an earlier edition of that work actually be discovered, the date of Marlowe's play might be pushed back, but nothing which we know of the play necessitates the hypothesis of such an earlier edition.⁴⁸

5. *The Jew of Malta*

The Jew of Malta was on the stage in the winter of 1591/92. Henslowe's record of dramatic performances at the Rose Theatre begins February 19, 1592. Just a week later he notes the first of his list of thirty-six representations of this play: 'Rd. at the Jewe of malltuse the 26 of febrearye 1591 (1592) ls.' Evidently the play had been performed before: this is indicated by the absence of Henslowe's mark 'ne' and by the moderate amount of the earnings—fifty shillings as compared with £3 16s. 8d. for the new *Harry the Sixth* on March 3rd.

The reference in the third line of the play, 'And now the *Guize* is dead,' fixes the date of composition as subsequent to the assassination of Guise, December 23, 1588.⁴⁹ Composition in 1589 would best suit this allusion, and would best

⁴⁸ Critics have habitually assumed that Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (acted as an old play, Feb. 19, 1591/2) was written in imitation of *Doctor Faustus*. The idea appears to be based chiefly on the presumption against Greene created by his plagiarism of *Tamburlaine* in *Alphonsus*. As Ward properly says (*Old English Drama*) there is no evidence for determining the priority of either play.

⁴⁹ A. Wagner's quibble that the opening speech by Machiavel, in which this allusion is found, may possibly have been written subsequently to the rest of the play does not deserve consideration, unless one wishes to interpret the mention of Guise's death as hinting at Marlowe's Tragedy of the Guise (*Massacre at Paris*), first acted January 30, 1593.

explain the violence of plot which *The Jew of Malta* shares with *Tamburlaine*.⁵⁰

It is not to be supposed that the extant text represents very faithfully the play of Marlowe. Certain alterations were probably introduced on the occasion of the revival in May, 1601, when Henslowe records the purchase of 'divers thinges for the Jewe of Malta.' Changes of a more serious character were presumably made by Thomas Heywood a quarter century or more later, when he prepared the play for revival at court and at the Cockpit Theatre. Whether on this occasion Heywood introduced a hand or merely 'a main finger' into Marlowe's work is not easy to determine. The first two acts seem to be nearly pure Marlowe.⁵¹ The item from the inventory of the Lord Admiral's Men, 'j cauderm for the Jewe,' is good evidence also that the final catastrophe has not been altered since Henslowe's time.

It is in the third and fourth acts that alien matter can most reasonably be suspected. The Bellamira scenes have rather the air of an interpolation, and do not resemble Marlowe's work. They have been ascribed to Heywood by Fleay.⁵² W. Wagner (*Sh.-Jb.* xi. 74 f.) sees particular traces of Heywood in one passage from them, lines 1716-1852. A connection with Heywood is certainly established by the Friars' scenes in the fourth act. Fleay noted the similarity of the last of these (lines 1623-1715) to the underplot in Heywood's

⁵⁰ The reference to the Jew of Malta in one of Harington's epigrams is supposed by Collier to date from 1592 (Collier's Dodsley viii. 243-45); but Harington's words only prove that the play was then well known:

'Of a devout Vsurer.

Was euer Iew of Malta or of Millain

Then this most damned Iew, more Iewish villain?' (*Epigrams*, bk. iii.16)

⁵¹ Hallam's words have been frequently quoted with approval: 'The first two acts of *The Jew of Malta* are more vigorously conceived, both as to character and circumstance, than any other Elizabethan play, except those of Shakespeare.'

⁵² 'In the scenes with Bellamira and Pilia Borza there is a good deal not by Marlowe. This is not due to original collaboration, but to alteration by Heywood c. 1632. Compare *The Captives* (the part with the friars).' (*Biog. Chron. Engl. Dr.* ii. 61, 62.)

play, *The Captives*. Aronstein (*Anglia* xxxvii. 255) agrees that lines 1638-1715 are by this evidence proved to be Heywood's. I can find no verbal resemblance between *The Captives* and *The Jew of Malta*; but it seems reasonable to suspect at least a large infusion of Heywood in all the passages just referred to.

6. *Tamburlaine*

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries *Tamburlaine* was not always ascribed to Marlowe. Milton's blundering nephew, Edward Phillips, in his *Theatrum Poetarum* (1675) asserted that it was written by Thomas Newton.⁵³ Anthony Wood (*Athenae Oxonienses*, 1691, i. 288), in speaking of Newton, remarks that he 'was author, as a certain⁵⁴ writer saith, of two Tragedies, viz. of the first and second parts of *Tamerline the great Scythian Emperor*, but false. For in *Tho. Newtons* time the said two parts were performed by Christop. Marlo, sometimes a Student in Cambridge; afterwards, first an actor on the stage, then, (as *Shakespeare*, whose contemporary he was), a maker of plays, tho' inferior both in fancy and merit.' Langbaine writes in a similar strain: 'I know not how Mr. Philips came (pag. 182) to ascribe *Tamburlaine the Great* to this Author [i.e., Newton]; for tho' Marloe's Name be not printed in the Title-page, yet both in Mr. Kirkman's and my former Catalogue printed 1680 his Name is prefix'd.'

Elsewhere, however,⁵⁵ Langbaine says of Marlowe's claim to *Tamburlaine*: 'Had I not Mr. Heywood's Word for it, in the fore-mentioned Prologue [i.e., to the *Jew of Malta*], I should not believe this Play to be his.'

Farmer and Malone vacillated considerably in their beliefs. In his first edition of Shakespeare (1790), Malone took it

⁵³ Phillips advances no proof of this statement; nor can any reason for it be conceived save that Newton is author of *A Notable Historie of the Saracens* (1575), an apparent source of the play.

⁵⁴ Footnote: 'Edw. Phillips in his *Theatrum Poetarum*.'

⁵⁵ *Some Account of English Dramatick Poets*, 1691, p. 344.

for granted that the play was Marlowe's.⁵⁶ Later he inserted the following manuscript note in his copy of *Langbaine*, now in the Bodleian: 'My friend Dr. Farmer thinks that *Tamburlaine* was not written by Marlowe. A passage in *The Black Book* by T. M., 1604, seems to insinuate that Thos. Nashe was the author.'⁵⁷ The substance of this note is found in the Boswell-Malone Shakespeare (iii. 357). Shortly before his death, Malone added another note, dated Feb. 28, 1811, in his *Langbaine*: 'Langbaine's assertion that Heywood attributes *Tamburlaine* to Marlowe in his prologue to the *Jew of Malta* is founded in a mistake and a false punctuation. Heywood only asserts that Alleyn was famous in the part of *Tamburlaine*, not that Marlowe wrote the play. *Tamburlaine*, I now believe, was written by Nich.⁸ Breton, the author of the *Three Bold Beauchamps*, & *England's Joy*.'⁵⁸

Robinson, editor of the 1826 Marlowe, quotes with approval both the conjecture that *Tamburlaine* was written in whole or part by Nashe, and also another by Farmer,

⁵⁶ Cf. vol. iv. p. 567.

⁵⁷ In another note, written in his copy of the 1605/6 *Tamburlaine*, Malone repeats the passage in the *Black Book*: 'the spindle-shanke spyders, which shewed like great leachers, with little legs, went stalking ouer his [Thomas Nashe's] head, as if they had been conning of *Tamburlayne*'; and adds: 'Does not this seem to insinuate that Nashe was either the author of this play, or at least assisted Marlowe in writing it?' Dyce properly points out that the passage does not support Malone's reasoning: 'It means, I have no doubt, that the spiders stalked with the tragic gait of an actor practising the part of *Tamburlaine*.'

Hallam, who calls the piece 'the production wholly or principally of Marlowe,' yet remarks that 'Nash has been thought the author of *Tamburlaine* by Malone, and his inflated style, in pieces known to be his, may give some countenance to this hypothesis.' Bullen observes that Nashe's derogatory remarks in his preface to *Menaophon* about the type of drama represented by *Tamburlaine* prove that he could not have been responsible for it.

⁵⁸ Evidently Malone was led to this strange conclusion by the references in Suckling's *Goblins* and Davenant's *Playhouse to be Let*. See *The Reputation of Christopher Marlowe*, *Trans. Conn. Academy* xxv, p. 372, 383 f.

'that the play, Tamburlaine, praised by Heywood, might be different from the bombast one, and that written by Kyd.' James Broughton, in his privately printed edition of the play in 1818 and in his manuscript notes on Robinson's edition, expresses similar incredulity regarding Marlowe's authorship;⁵⁹ and the anonymous writer of the account of Marlowe prefixed to an edition of *Doctor Faustus* of about the same period⁶⁰ has the following remarks:

'In compliance with the received opinion, Tamberlaine the Great is introduced into the following list of Marlowe's dramatic works: indeed, if external evidence be refused, we have not any sufficiently strong to warrant its rejection; although a very inferior production, unworthy the genius to whom it is ascribed: but it should be mentioned that Langbaine thinks it questionable; and Mr. Oldys⁶¹ observes: "it has been suspected that the great character given the author by his contemporaries, drew impositions of works upon him that he never wrote."'⁶²

It stands to the credit of J. P. Collier that he positively reasserted Marlowe's authorship of *Tamburlaine*, and with such authority as finally to set to rest the doubts and cavils of his contemporaries. Appreciation of this unquestionable service in the cause of truth is, however, tempered by the fact that Collier sought to make assurance doubly sure by introducing in evidence an entry relating to 'Marloes Tam-

⁵⁹ In his first article in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (1830) Broughton says that the question of Marlowe's authorship of *Tamburlaine* remains doubtful, and adds: 'but for my own part, after again attentively perusing the play, comparing the style with that of Marlowe's acknowledged productions, and carefully weighing the evidence *pro* and *con*, I am inclined to believe that he was *not* the author.'

⁶⁰ Printed, without date by Whittingham and Rowland; ascribed by the Bodleian catalogue to the year 1814.

⁶¹ Note: 'MS. notes on Langbaine.'

⁶² Further, Lowndes records that 'In the British Museum Catalogue, *Tamburlaine the Great*, 1605, is attributed to John Marston.' It is of course not so attributed at present. When it was, and on what grounds, I do not know.

belan' in Henslowe's Diary (Dec. 20, 1597), which is an undoubted forgery,⁶³ and by decidedly straining the evidential value of Heywood's squinting reference to *Tamburlaine* in his Prologue to the *Jew of Malta*.

Regarding the style of *Tamburlaine*, the one perfectly convincing criterion of its Marlovian origin, Collier writes rather perversely: 'The most reasonable ground for resisting the claim of Marlow to the two parts of *Tamburlaine the Great*, arises out of some obvious defects in its style—that it is turgid and bombastic—that the language is not pure, and that the thoughts are sometimes violent and unnatural.'⁶⁴ This, Collier explains, is because *Tamburlaine* was an experiment: it was written with the definite purpose of supplanting prose and rime by blank verse, the 'swelling bombast' being a kind of substitute for the attraction of rime. 'Many lines "full of sound and fury,"' Collier continues implausibly, 'were not inserted in his experimental play because he thought them good, but because he hoped the audience would think them so: he wrote *ad captandum*, and it is unfair to try him by the ordinary rules of good taste and sound criticism.'

It is very doubtful whether any critic would now go with Collier in ascribing the extravagances of *Tamburlaine* to deliberate consideration of expediency; but none now doubts that internal evidence positively establishes Marlowe's authorship. Dyce, who accepted Collier's external evidence at its face value, and Bullen, who brusquely asserted that there is no external evidence of authorship, were equally certain that Marlowe wrote the play; nor is it conceivable that dissent will ever again be expressed by reputable judges.

Though the external testimony associating Marlowe with *Tamburlaine* may safely be waived, it is not absolutely negligible. One of the points cited by Collier—Heywood's mention of *Tamburlaine* along with *Hero and Leander* and

⁶³ Cf. Warner, *Dulwich Library Catalogue*, 159, 160; and Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*.

⁶⁴ *Hist. Engl. Dr. Poet.* iii. 115.

The Jew of Malta in his praise of Marlowe and Alleyn can hardly be thrown out without casuistry.⁶⁵ The passages from Anthony Wood and Langbaine, already quoted, evidence a seventeenth century tradition in favor of Marlowe's authorship, which is the stronger inasmuch as it is not based upon the testimony of any title-page. The record of the performance of the two parts by the Lord Admiral's Company harmonizes with the idea that they are Marlowe's work, whereas no evidence which has survived points to any other author.

Collier's statement that *Tamburlaine* was the first play to introduce blank verse upon the public stage would appear to be correct, unless priority of date be assigned to *The Spanish Tragedy*. Earlier dramas in blank verse, such as *Gorboduc* and Gascoigne's *Jocasta*, were for private representation only. It is therefore of particular interest to determine the year in which *Tamburlaine* was produced. Malone properly argued from the allusions in the preface to Greene's *Perimedes* (licensed March 29, 1588) that the play must have been acted before 1588. Greene's words, 'daring God out of heauen with that Atheist *Tamburlan*,' show, moreover, that he had in mind particularly the second part of the play (see lines 4284 ff.).⁶⁶ Since the prologue to *Tamburlaine II* (lines 2317-19) specifically states (what the structure of the second part confirms) that the poet began the later drama only as a result of the confirmed success of

⁶⁵ Collier's citation of the line in Gabriel Harvey's *Gorgon* 'sonnet': 'Weepe, Powles; Thy Tamberlaine voutsafes to die,' must however be thrown out, I think. It is not likely that Harvey was referring to Marlowe's death in this poem.

⁶⁶ Another indication of Greene's familiarity with the second part of *Tamburlaine* is found in *Menaphon* (licensed Aug. 23, 1589): 'Stand not in doubt man, for be she base, I reade that mightie *Tamburlaine* after his wife *Zenocrate* (the worlds faire eye) past out of the Theater of this mortall life, he chose stigmaticall trulls to please his humorous fancie.' (Grosart's *Greene* vi. 84. Cf. *Tamb.* 2570). Collier's assertion that *Menaphon* was printed in 1587 (which would further push back the date of *Tamburlaine*) is incorrect.

the first part on the stage, production of part two before the end of March, 1588, would imply that part one can hardly have been written later than the beginning of 1587. It probably belongs to Marlowe's last year at Cambridge.

B. NON-DRAMATIC WORKS

1. *Hero and Leander*

'A book entitled *Hero and Leander*, being an amorous poem devised by Christopher Marlow,' was licensed for publication, September 28, 1593, by John Wolf. The poem is clearly mature work, and is evidently incomplete in the form in which Marlowe left it. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume, as has commonly been done, that it is one of Marlowe's latest works, left unfinished at his death.⁶⁷ We may infer that the author was impelled to take up non-dramatic writing by the fact that the Privy Council recommended the closing of playhouses (on account of plague) on January 28, 1593. Henslowe's entries cease in fact on February 1, and do not begin again till the end of the following December. Thus it would seem that during the last four months of Marlowe's life he can have had no immediate incentive to the writing of plays.

Notwithstanding Wolf's entry, no edition of *Hero and Leander* is known to have been published earlier than 1598; nor do there seem to be any literary allusions to the poem that point to its having been generally known before that year. The continuations of Chapman and Petowe, Meres's mention in *Palladis Tamia*, quotations by Jonson in *Every Man in his Humor* and Shakespeare in *As You Like it*, all belong to this year or the next. Malone imagined that the poem had been printed in 1593, reasoning from the Stationers' record and also, doubtless, from the fact that there is a suggestion of recent loss about Blount's mention of the

⁶⁷ Malone says (MS. note): 'This was, I believe, Marlowe's *last* work; and it appears to me his most finished performance: I mean the two first Sestiads, for which alone he is answerable. Many of the lines remind one of Dryden.'

deceased poet, in his dedication to Walsingham, not very easy to reconcile with the idea that five years had elapsed.⁶⁸ It is certain, however, that Blount cannot have addressed Walsingham under the title of Sir Thomas earlier than 1597, since it was only in consequence of Elizabeth's visit to Walsingham in that year that he was knighted.⁶⁹ That Blount's publication of the Marlowe fragment should have synchronized so exactly with the appearance of both Chapman's and Petowe's continuations, and that Blount's edition should have appeared in 1598, when the Stationers' Register shows that he had disposed of his copyright in the work in 1597,⁷⁰ are circumstances largely explainable by the close connection between the different publishers concerned. Blount, Linley, and Flasket, successive publishers of the poem, were intimately associated: they all did business at the sign of the Black Bear in Paul's Churchyard, to which Blount and Flasket had succeeded on the death in 1594 of Thomas Woodcock, the publisher of *Dido*.⁷¹

The division of *Hero and Leander* between Marlowe and Chapman is clear enough. Marlowe wrote what is contained in Blount's edition of 1598. This Chapman divided into two 'Sestiads,' adding an argument to each, and wrote himself the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth Sestiads. There would be no need to speak of this, had Malone not made a false inference at a time when he had not seen the original quarto edition of Marlowe's part of the poem. In one of his manu-

⁶⁸ Opposite the first page of the dedication in his copy of the edition of 1600, Malone wrote: 'This was, I believe, the Dedication to an edition of the two first Cantos of this poem by Marlowe, printed as I imagine in 1593. From this dedication it should seem that there had been an edition of that part of this poem which was written by Marlowe, soon after his death, which happened in 1593. See the Entry at Stationer's Hall.'

⁶⁹ Cf. D. N. B.

⁷⁰ *I.e.*, by Elizabethan reckoning. The record is dated March 2 (1597/8), and reads: 'Paule Lynlay. Assigned ouer vnto hym from Edward Blount, by the consent of the Wardens, A booke in Englishe called HERO and LEANDER, vjd.'

⁷¹ Cf. McKerrow, *Dictionary of Publishers and Booksellers*.

script notes, he says: 'It appears from *England's Parnassus*, 1600, p. 379, that Marlowe wrote but the two first Sestiads and about 100 lines of the third; for the description of *Ceremony*, beginning at the 105th line, is there ascribed to Chapman. The compiler of that book had probably the complete & the unfinished work before him.' The error of ascribing any lines beyond the first two cantos to Marlowe is evident on bibliographical and stylistic evidence;⁷² but Malone's mistake has been repeated,⁷³ and it led Cunningham into a further quite unjustifiable ascription:

'Malone told Thomas Warton that, in addition to the two first Sestiads, Marlowe left behind him "about a hundred lines of the third"; which, however, in my opinion are not to be looked for in the place assigned to them, where all is manifestly Chapman's, but in the episode of Teras, and other portions of the fifth Sestiad, where the higher hand of Marlowe seems to me easily discernible.'⁷⁴

2. *The Passionate Shepherd to his Love*

A manuscript note by Malone collects the essential facts about this poem:

'Four stanzas of this Sonnet were first printed in *The Passionate Pilgrim*, 1599, 8^{vo}, where it is ascribed to Shakespeare; in the following year the whole was printed in *England's Helicon*, and subscribed with Marlowe's name. Isaac Walton, who has introduced it in his *Complete Angler*, written about 1640, expressly says it was Marlowe's; "that smooth song (he calls it) which was made by Kit Marlowe, now at least fifty years ago." One of the lines is found in Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*; and not marked as a quotation:

Thou in those groves, by Dis above,
Shalt live with me and be my love.

⁷² Malone himself later gave up the idea. See the two notes previously quoted.

⁷³ Cf. Thorpe's Catalogue, no. v for 1835, p. 124: 'The first two Sestiads, and about one hundred lines of the third, were written by Marlow, and the remainder by Chapman.'

⁷⁴ Introduction to his edition, p. xvii.

There can be no doubt, therefore, that it was his composition. This Sonnet was answered by Sir Walter Raleigh in his youth. The Answer is inserted in *England's Helicon*, 1600, in the *Complete Angler*, and in Percy's *Reliques*, Vol. I. p. 219.'

The implied ascription of the verses to Shakespeare in *The Passionate Pilgrim* may be an act of carelessness or of deliberate fraud; but it should be noted that they occur in the second part of the *Passionate Pilgrim* volume, which has a separate title-page, *Sonnets to Sundry Notes of Music*, whereon there is no mention of Shakespeare's name. Besides four stanzas of Marlowe's poem one stanza from the reply ascribed to Raleigh is there given.

Percy derived his versions of the poem and the reply from a broadside in the Roxburgh Ballads (vol. i, p. 205), where the two are printed in parallel columns. The first is headed: 'A most excellent Ditty of the Louers promises to his beloued. To a sweet new tune called, *Liue with me and be my Loue*,' and the second: 'The Ladies prudent answer to her Loue. To the same tune.' The date of the Roxburgh ballad can be approximately fixed by the imprint: 'Printed by the Assignes of Thomas symcock.' In 1618 Symcock received a patent for thirty-one years granting him a monopoly of all things printed on one side only. He then appointed assigns to work the patent. Protests and litigation followed, and on June 30, 1629 this patent was ordered cancelled.⁷⁵

There seems to be no clue to the date at which Marlowe wrote the song of the Passionate Shepherd, except the parody of the first line in the *Jew of Malta* (l. 1816). Whether the remarkable passage in which this parody occurs was in the play as Marlowe originally composed it is however doubtful.

3. Fragment: '*I walkt along a stream*'

The fragment describing a woodland brook, which was printed in *England's Parnassus* (1600) over the name of

⁷⁵ Cf. McKerrow, *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers*.

Ch. Marlowe, is the only extant work of the poet to employ an elaborate stanzaic form. The metre is the *ottava rima* (a, b, a, b, a, b, c, c):⁷⁶ lines 5-12 and 13-20 are complete stanzas, while 1-4 form the latter half of one and 21-24 the first half of another. It is evident, therefore, that the lines preserved neither begin nor end the poem from which they are taken. The versification of the piece is perfect, and at least five of the twenty-four lines have the run-on movement.⁷⁷

Dyce thought it safe to conclude from a belief (now discredited) that the editor of *England's Parnassus* never made use of manuscript material, that the lines 'were extracted from some printed piece, of which not a single copy now remains.' Charles Crawford⁷⁸ proposed the theory that Marlowe wrote a poem in elaboration of *Come Live with me*, of which the present fragment may be a part, and that this was used in Marlowe's own plays and imitated in Richard Barnfield's *Affectionate Shepherd* (1594) and *Cynthia* (1595).

Dyce's warm praise of this fragment is well justified by its felicity both of phrasing and metre. 'Most probably,' he conjectures of the complete work, 'it was a composition of no great length: but the stanzas in question present so fine a picture of objects seen through a poetic medium, that, in exchange for the rest, every reader of taste would willingly part with a dozen of those long and tedious productions which are precious in the estimation of antiquaries alone.' Ingram, on the contrary, expresses a wanton agnosticism regarding both the poetic beauty of the lines and their ascription to Marlowe.⁷⁹ It seems to me that they must be accepted as

⁷⁶ This is the metre of Daniel's *Civil Wars* and Drayton's *Barons' Wars*. *Venus and Adonis* has the corresponding six-line stanza: a b a b c c.

⁷⁷ Lines 2, 3(?), 8, 10, 16, 24. Why the anthologist chose to break off in the midst of a clause is hard to imagine.

⁷⁸ 'Richard Barnfield, Marlowe, and Shakespeare in *Collectanea*.'

⁷⁹ 'The lines, "I walked along a stream for pureness rare," may be an extract from a charming poem, but in themselves the verses scarcely seem

work of the poet's full maturity, parallel in date as in tone with *Hero and Leander*. They are a valuable evidence of Marlowe's versatility, for they indicate the possession of an aptitude for graceful stanzaic verse after the Spenserian fashion which no other extant production of his attests.

4. *Lucan's First Book*

The translation of the first book of Lucan's *Pharsalia* is remarkable for containing a far higher percentage of eleven-syllable lines than any other work of Marlowe. Bullen's count of 109 double endings in the 694 lines is at least approximately correct; but whether this indicates, as Sidney Lee believes,⁸⁰ that the work was produced late is perhaps doubtful. Freedom in the employment of eleven-syllable lines is not so sure an index of maturity with Marlowe's work as with Shakespeare's; and it may be that the frequency with which the eleventh syllable appears in the Lucan is in part due simply to the translator's earnest effort to pack into each English verse the whole content of a Latin hexameter. The boast that Lucan is 'translated line for line' is well justified, and the achievement is decidedly interesting; but it is accomplished often at so great a cost to English idiom and at such sacrifice of the translator's individuality as to make it seem more likely the work of Marlowe's apprentice days than of the period of *Hero and Leander*. There is not much plausibility in Bullen's suggestion that this translation was probably intended as a metrical experiment, possibly for a projected epic; just as the translation of the *Amores* was a prelude to *Hero and Leander* (*sic*)—unless indeed one dates it very early in Marlowe's career.

to call for the admiring comments they have lately received. It would not be surprising to discover that this fragment, fathered on Marlowe after his decease, whilst his name was one to conjure by, owes its origin to Michael Drayton.' (*Marlowe and his Associates*, 220). Ingram goes on to say that the lines are much like the description of Queen Isabel's chamber in 'The Tower of Mortimer' in *The Barons' Wars*.

⁸⁰ 'The author displays sufficient mastery of the metre to warrant its attribution to his later years.'

The first reference to Marlowe's *Lucan* is a notice in the Stationers' Register, September 28, 1593, when John Wolf entered for his copy 'a book entituled *Lucan's* first book of the famous civil war betwixt Pompey and Caesar, Englished by Christopher Marlow.' On the same day Wolf entered also Marlowe's part of *Hero and Leander*. The title to both works appears to have passed to Edward Blount, though no record of the transfer exists. In 1600, the only known early edition of *Lucan* was published, as printed by P. Short and offered for sale by Walter Burre. The interesting dedicatory epistle is signed by Thomas Thorpe⁸¹ and addressed to Blount, whose 'old right in it' is acknowledged.⁸²

5. *Ovid's Elegies*

Marlowe's version of the three books of Ovid's *Amores* has always been printed in conjunction with the epigrams of John Davies (who was knighted in 1603). There is no inherent reason for associating the two works, and their different authorship is made clear on all the title-pages. Six early editions are known, all undated, but as typographical evidence shows, covering a period of forty or fifty years (ca. 1600-1640). Four give the complete text both of *Elegies* and *Epigrams*, while two contain selections only. All were surreptitious publications, containing no indication of publisher or printer, beyond the words 'At Middleburgh' at the foot of each title-page.⁸³ The two abridged editions

⁸¹ Thorpe, the famous publisher of Shakespeare's sonnets, does not appear to have published anything on his own behalf before 1604. See McKerrow, *Dictionary of Publishers and Booksellers*.

⁸² In the same year (1600) John Flasket published a complete edition of *Hero and Leander* (Marlowe's and Chapman's parts) with the curiously erroneous title-page: 'Hero and Leander: Begunne by Christopher Marloe: Whereunto is added the first booke of *Lucan* translated line for line by the same Author.' See the discussion of *Hero and Leander* for the relations of the various publishers concerned.

⁸³ In connection with the publication of English books at Middleburgh in Zeeland (Holland) see J. D. Wilson, 'Richard Schilders and the English Puritans,' *Trans. Bibl. Soc.*, 1910. Schilders printed a large number of Puritan tracts at Middleburgh between 1580 and 1616. He appears to have been the only printer in the place.

give the full name of the translator of the Elegies: 'C. Marlow'; the others content themselves with the initials, 'C. M.'

It is impossible to determine when the Elegies first appeared. The four surviving complete texts all give, in addition to Marlowe's rendering of the last elegy of the first book, the entirely different translation of the same which Ben Jonson made for his *Poetaster*, and so cannot be earlier than the date of that play (acted in 1601, printed in 1602). The abridged editions do not contain this, but neither of them can be regarded as the *editio princeps*. That an edition existed in 1599 is positively proved by a well-known decree of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London (June 1, 1599), commanding the destruction among other works of 'Davyes Epigrams, with Marlowes Elegyes,' and specifying 'That no Satyres or Epigrams be printed hereafter.' On June 4, accordingly, 'Davies Epigrams' were burned in Stationer's Hall. The particular wrath of the authorities appears to have been directed against Davies' work rather than Marlowe's, but as the two were bound together, the latter was naturally included in the holocaust. One copy at least may be presumed to have escaped, to serve as progenitor of the Middleburgh series of editions. As early as 1594, in his *Unfortunate Traveller*, Nashe quotes Marlowe's version of two lines of the *Amores* (II. iii. 3, 4), but Nashe's connection with *Dido* in this same year makes it likely that he had at hand Marlowe's manuscript rather than a printed copy.

That Marlowe intended the translation to be printed is highly improbable. There is every reason to believe, on metrical and stylistic grounds, that it was made early in the poet's career—doubtless at Cambridge—when his taste, his learning, and his talent were all undeveloped. The *Elegies* find their natural place in his evolution beside, or rather antecedent to, the *Dido* and the lost rendering of Coluthus, which he is said to have produced in 1587.

II. SPURIOUS WORKS

A. PLAYS

1. *Troublesome Reign of John*

The Troublesome Reign of John King of England, published in two parts in 1591, contains a prologue clearly intended to link the work with *Tamburlaine*:

You that with friendly grace of smoothed brow
Have entertained the Scythian Tamburlaine,
And given applause unto an infidel,
Vouchsafe to welcome with like courtesy
A warlike Christian and your countryman.¹

Malone was inclined to attribute this play to Marlowe;¹ and Broughton (*Gentleman's Magazine*, March, 1830) asserted temerarily: 'That Marlowe, if he wrote "*Tamburlaine*," wrote also the old "*King John*," is incontestably proved by the Prologue to that play.'² Dyce, further influenced by two parallels between the close of the old *King John* and the early versions of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, felt himself forced to an admission of Marlowe's partial concern, which evidently did violence to his judgment. 'But, on the other hand,' he concludes, 'there are many things throughout *The Troublesome Raigne* so materially at variance with the style of Marlowe, that, while I admit the probability of his co-operation in the play, I cannot assent to the critical *dictum* which would attribute the whole of it to him.' Fleay (*Biog. Chron. Engl. Dr.*, ii. 65) invokes Dyce's authority a little loosely in support of his opinion that the work 'was in the end portion partly written by Marlow.'³

¹ Boswell-Malone *Shakspeare*, ii. 313: 'some circumstances which have lately struck me, confirm an opinion which I formerly hazarded, that Christopher Marlowe was the author of that play.'

² Broughton doubtless ventured this statement the more lightly because of his disbelief in Marlowe's authorship of *Tamburlaine*.

³ In Fleay's *Shakspeare*, p. 27, he says that the old *King John* plays 'were written for the Queen's Men in 1589 by Peele, Marlowe, and Lodge.' Sidney Lee (*D. N. B.*, Marlowe) offers doubtful homage to Fleay when he remarks that the work 'may in its concluding portions be by Marlowe, but many of his contemporaries could have done as well.'

The association of Marlowe's name with the old *King John* seems quite unwarranted. Bullen's words on the subject are not, I think, too severe: 'Earless and unabashed must be the critic who would charge Marlowe with any complicity in the authorship.' Regarding the Prologue, Bullen continues: 'So far from indicating that the author of *Tamburlaine* had written the piece that was about to be presented, these lines rather show that the "warlike Christian" was intended to oust the "infidel" from popular favour,—that the new play was the production of some obscure rival of Marlowe's.' That is, the relation of the prologue of the *Troublesome Reign to Tamburlaine* is analogous to the relation of the prologue of *The First Part of Sir John Oldcastle* to Shakespeare's *Henry IV*.

Even less justified is the suggestion that Marlowe may have had a hand in the rewritten *King John* by Shakespeare. Ingram writes cloudily on this subject (*Chr. Marlowe and his Associates*, 169): 'The general opinion is that Greene was the part-author of the older play, and that it was the work, or one of the works, he referred to in his attack on Shakespeare. . . . Much of the old play, however, is too vigorous, too manly, and too straight-forward to have been the composition of Greene, so that if he had anything to do with the work, it must have been as a partner with a better man, but who that man was is too speculative a subject to hazard a suggestion about. That the greatly revised and much improved version of *King John* by Shakespeare contained some of Marlowe's work no one thoroughly acquainted with his mannerisms can doubt, but the suggestion that he wrote the whole of it is preposterous.'⁴ I am not aware that the last truly preposterous suggestion was ever made.

⁴ Compare the similarly vague words of Courtney:

'It is possible that Shakespeare and Marlowe worked together on *The Troublesome Raigne of John, King of England* (though Greene probably had a hand in it, hence his sneers about Shakespeare's plagiarism), and while the character of The Bastard is undoubtedly all Shakespeare, *King John* contains many Marlowe passages' (*Fortnightly Review*, Oct., 1905).

2. *Arden of Feversham*

The most probable author of the anonymous *Arden of Feversham* (licensed April 3, 1592) is Thomas Kyd, whose claims to the tragedy have been forcibly indicated by Charles Crawford (*Collectanea* i. 101-130). Mr. E. H. C. Oliphant argues in a manuscript letter that the play should rather be regarded as the joint production of Kyd and Marlowe. The verbal similarities between *Arden* and *Edward II* and in one case between *Arden* and *The Jew of Malta*, which Crawford interprets as plagiarisms by Kyd, are taken by Oliphant as rather marking the presence of Marlowe's hand. He then adds:

'Correspondences might also be cited between the two *Contention* plays and *Arden*; but it is not mere verbal parallels that have impelled me to regard Marlowe as part-author of *Arden*: it is rather the run of the verse in places, for now and then it seems to me of a quality distinctly Marlovian, and, so far as we know, beyond the capacity of Kyd. Consider, for instance, in III. v. the two long speeches covering lines 80 to 134: if these be not Marlowe's, whose are they? I do not wish to speak with positiveness, since it seems to me that the actual verse-construction of all the leading dramatists of the beginning of the last decade of the sixteenth century is much the same, however the achievement may vary. All I say is that the impression made on me by the verse in the passage I have adduced and others is that it possesses the indefinable something that sometimes distinguishes the work of Marlowe from that of his fellows; but that it is unfortunately incapable of proof. I admit that the resemblances between *Soliman* and *Edward II* may be due, as Crawford supposes, to imitation of Marlowe by Kyd, and therefore that the resemblances in *Arden* may also be attributable to imitation by Kyd; but I do not think that Kyd could so successfully attain the Marlovian music. I conclude then that *Soliman* is Kyd's, that *Arden* is Kyd's and Marlowe's, and that the *Contention* plays are probably

by the same two men (this, however, being an opinion that I have not put to a detailed test).'

Oliphant adds that the choice of ejaculations (e.g., Zounds, tush) and abusive epithets (knave, slave, peasant, churl, cur, groom, carle, coystiril, hind) suggests Marlowe even more than Kyd; and points out that the theory of collaboration between Marlowe and Kyd finds support in Kyd's reference to his writing in one chamber with Marlowe in 1591.

I believe the possibility that Marlowe may have assisted Kyd in *Arden of Feversham* comparable with the possibility that Kyd may have assisted Marlowe in *Lust's Dominion*. The traces of Marlowe's influence are undeniable both in the parallels to his acknowledged plays and in the general effect of certain passages such as that cited by Oliphant. The plot and tone of the play as a whole seem to me so unlike Marlowe, however, as to leave imitation by Kyd a more likely hypothesis than partnership between the two poets.

3. *Titus Andronicus*

The idea that Marlowe was author of *Titus Andronicus*, first printed in 1594, was advanced with confidence, but without arguments, by James Broughton (*Gentleman's Magazine*, March, 1830). William Hazlitt had previously (*Lectures on Writers of Age of Elizabeth*, 1820) remarked that it was more like Marlowe than Shakespeare. Fleay (*Life of Shakspeare*, 1886, 281) says: 'That it was written by Marlowe I incline to think. What other mind but the author of *The Jew of Malta* could have conceived Aaron the Moor? . . . Nevertheless, I think the opinion that Kyd wrote this play of *Andronicus* worth the examination, although, with such evidence as has yet been adduced, Marlowe has certainly the better claim.' And Sir Sidney Lee repeats (Marlowe article, D. N. B., 1893): 'Internal evidence gives Marlowe some claim to be regarded as part author of *Titus Andronicus*, with which Shakespeare was very slightly, if at all, concerned. Aaron might have been drawn by the creator of the

Jew of Malta, but the theory that Kyd was largely responsible for the piece deserves consideration.' Bullen expresses positive conviction of Marlowe's authorship: 'As I re-read this play after coming straight from the study of Marlowe, I find again and again passages that, as it seems to me, no hand but his could have written.'⁵

W. C. Hazlitt (*Shakespeare*, 2nd. ed., 1902, p. 237) avowed his 'personal view' that the play is a work of Marlowe left incomplete at his death.⁶ The best recent critics of *Titus Andronicus*, however, are disposed to leave Marlowe out of their calculations; and there seems in fact to be nothing in the play which justifies any theory affirming his connection with it.

4. *Richard III*

In a passage in which hypothesis takes the place of argument (*Shakspeare*, 1886, p. 278, 279), Fleay imposes upon Marlowe a large part of the responsibility for *Richard III*: 'There can be little doubt that in this, as in *John*, Shakspeare derived his plot and part of his text from an anterior play, the difference in the two cases being that in *Richard III* he adopted much more of his predecessor's text. I believe that the anterior play was Marlowe's, partly written for Lord Strange's company in 1593, but left unfinished at Marlowe's death, and completed and altered by Shakspeare in 1594' . . .

⁵ Swinburne demurs in a letter to Bullen, Jan. 14, 1885: 'I hardly agree with you about *Titus Andronicus*. The third and fourth scenes of the fourth act have always seemed to me hardly unworthy of the (very) young Shakespeare, and not very like any one else—unless, perhaps, Kyd; certainly not Marlowe. And in the rest of the Play there are only here and there lines—never, (or hardly ever) a Scene—good enough for *our* poet.'

⁶ In his fourth, revised, edition, 1912, Hazlitt silently cancelled this statement.

⁷ In his study of the Dutch *Richard III* play, O. J. Campbell says of this passage: 'None of these conjectures finds corroboration in the *Roode en Witte Roos* except that the play clearly shows a formative influence upon the early Senecan treatment of the Chronicle material like that which Marlowe indubitably exercised.' (*The Position of the Roode en Witte Roos in the Saga of King Richard III*, Univ. Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, 1919, p. 57.)

I do not think it possible to separate Marlowe's work from Shakspeare's in this play—it is worked in with too cunning a hand.'

In an address read before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution in 1883, J. R. Lowell doubted Shakespeare's authorship of *Richard III*, but he did not specifically refer it to Marlowe. The undoubted traces of Marlowe's influence in the play seem by no means such as to imply his handiwork.⁸

5. *The Taming of a Shrew*

The Taming of a Shrew, printed in 1594 as acted by the Earl of Pembroke's Company, contains a great number of parallels with *Tamburlaine* and *Doctor Faustus*,⁹ which by a few critics have been interpreted to signify identity of authorship. James Broughton (*Gentleman's Magazine*, March, 1830) 'felt confident' that the play proceeded from Marlowe's pen; Grant White ascribed it to Greene, Marlowe, and possibly Shakespeare; and Fleay to Marlowe and Shakespeare conjointly. Dyce has very satisfactorily pointed out that the borrowed passages evidence plagiarism of Marlowe and nothing more. The matter is well discussed, in the same spirit, by Boas in Appendix I of the *Shakespeare Classics* edition of the play (1908).

6. *Selimus*

Mr. Charles Crawford has attempted to prove by means of parallel passages that the *First Part of the Tragical Reign of Selimus, sometime Emperor of the Turks*, published in 1594,

⁸ Marlowe's authorship is championed in a recent paper, by Mr. S. S. Ashbaugh and in Mr. Robertson's book, *The Shakespeare Canon* (1922).

⁹ Marlowe's authorship is championed in a recent paper, as yet unpublished, by Mrs. S. S. Ashbough.

⁹ The existence of these was apparently first noted specifically by an anonymous American correspondent of Charles Knight, who based thereon an argument for Marlowe's authorship. Cf. Knight's *Library Shakespeare*, 1842, ii. 114 ff. Broughton alludes only generally to 'particular passages, where the language is verbatim the same as in his acknowledged works.'

is 'the eldest of Marlowe's works.'¹⁰ The theory has very little to recommend it. It depends, among other things, upon acceptance of Crawford's argument that *Selimus* is earlier than the related play of *Lochrine*, whereas the fact seems to be that *Lochrine* is the earlier.¹¹ Greene's authorship of *Selimus*, argued by Grosart and others, remains far more probable than that of Marlowe.¹²

7. *Edward III*

Fleay is very positive in his championship of the anonymous *Edward III* (published, 1596) as a play by Marlowe, later revised by Shakespeare. '*Edward III*, by Marlowe, was, with alterations by Shakspeare, acted about the city in 1594,' he asserts in his *Life of Shakspeare* (p. 23). Later in the volume (p. 118, 119) he repeats: 'About the same time (1594) an earlier play of Marlowe's originally acted ca. 1589, was altered and revised by Shakspeare. . . . The original date and authorship will appear from the following quotations.'¹³

8. *A Larum for London*

A Larum for London, or The Siege of Antwerp, published in 1602 as acted by the Lord Chamberlain's Company, was ascribed (in part) to Marlowe by Collier, on the testimony of the following lines of manuscript 'written by some early possessor on its title-page':

Our famous Marloe had in this a hand,
As from his fellowes I doe vnderstand.

¹⁰ Crawford's paper was first published in *Notes and Queries*, 1901. It is reprinted in *Collectanea* i. 47-100 (1906).

¹¹ Cf. Malone Society *Collections* I. 2. 108-110 (1908) and F. G. Hubbard, *Lochrine and Selimus* (p. 17-35 of Shakespeare Studies by Members of the Department of English of the University of Wisconsin, 1916).

¹² The case for Greene's authorship is considerably stronger than Dr. Grosart recognized when he advanced it. Cf. H. Gilbert, *R. Greene's Selimus*.

¹³ Sidney Lee admits, doubtless under the influence of Fleay's arguments, that 'Evidence of style also gives Marlowe some pretension to a share in *Edward III*.' No such evidence appears to the present writer. The quotations which Fleay points to have no evidential value.

The printed copie doth his Muse much wrong;
 But natheles manie lines ar good and strong:
 Of *Paris' Massaker* such was the fate;
 A perfitt coppie came to hand to late.

Dyce quotes these lines unsuspectingly from Collier; Bullen dubs them 'a very ridiculous piece of forgery.'¹⁴ Neither Dyce, nor any other critic than Collier, has found in the play credible evidence of Marlowe's workmanship, though it does contain a few trivial resemblances to *The Massacre at Paris*.

9. *The Maiden's Holiday*

The books of the Stationers' Company record that on April 8, 1654, 'Master Mosely Entred . . . a comedie called *The Maidens Holiday* by Christopher Marlow and John Day.' This was a period of reckless ascriptions. In 1653 Moseley entered *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* as a play by Shakespeare. On Sept. 9, 1653, plays called *Henry I* and *Henry II* were entered as 'by Wm. Shakespeare and Robert Davenport.' No edition of *The Maiden's Holiday* seems to have been published, and the manuscript is supposed to have been destroyed by the cook of John Warburton.

Any real collaboration between Marlowe and Day is out of the question, since Day's literary career seems only to have begun in 1599; and the idea that Marlowe left a comedy later completed or revised by Day has nothing to support it but Moseley's unconfirmed registration notice.

10. *Lust's Dominion*

Metrical evidence renders it impossible to take very seriously the claim of the title-page that *Lust's Dominion* was written by Marlowe. Rime abounds to an extent altogether disproportionate to that found in Marlowe's blank verse: I count 561 riming lines. Hemistichs, rare in Marlowe, are so frequent in *Lust's Dominion* as to constitute a distinct

¹⁴ A suspicious-looking motive for forgery is offered by the fact that the ast two lines confirm Collier's discovery of an 'improved' manuscript version of a scene in *The Massacre at Paris*. I do not know where the copy of the *Larum for London* quarto with the lines in question is now to be found.

mannerism. There are 199 lines in which the pentameter is divided between two speakers and thirty-five others in which three or even four speeches combine to form a metrical verse.¹⁵ The tendency to run-on and eleven-syllable lines is also rather more marked than one would expect to find in a work by Marlowe. There are at least 47 run-on and 24 eleven-syllable verses in the first three hundred lines of the play, 45 run-on and 15 eleven-syllable verses in the last three hundred.

The influence of Marlowe is, however, clearly evident, both in structure and characterization and in phraseology. The Queen-Mother and Eleazar are replicas of the Queen-Mother and Guise in *The Massacre at Paris*. Compare the plot against the Queen's younger son in II. ii with *MP* 517 ff. and 637 ff. The employment of the Friars recalls both the *Massacre* and *The Jew of Malta*. Compare Eleazar's words in II. ii.

Their holy callings will approve the fact
Most good and meritorious

with *MP* 1147. The early part of the prose scene, III. v., recalls *MP* 812 ff., and the later part *JM* 1529 ff.

¹⁵ E.g., (I. i.) *Q.-M.* Why dost thou frown? at whom?

Ele. At thee.

Q.-M. At me.

(IV. ii) *Phil.* You will not?

Car. No.

Phil. Coward!

Car. By deeds I'll try.

(V. v) *Ele.* Zarack.

Zar. My lord.

Ele. Where's Balthazar?

Zar. A-drumming.

Edward II has a single clear example of the line divided between three speakers (2193-95)

Matr. It shall be done my lord.

Mor. iu. Gurney.

Gurn. My Lorde.

2228-30 might be considered another instance, but the three speeches do not here form a regular pentameter.

The latter part of the Queen-Mother's speech, (I. i. 45-58) seems based on Gaveston's speech in *Edward II*, 50 ff.; while Eleazar's last speech in I. ii suggests Guise's soliloquy, *MP* 91 ff.; and Eleazar's threat in III. iv recalls that of Barabas in *JM* 2308-24. So in the first scene of the last act Eleazar's third speech is clearly reminiscent of *Tamburlaine* 762-9 and 369, 370.

Echoes of Marlowe are frequently discernible also in single lines; e.g.,

Whose was that screech-owl's voice that, like the sound
Of a hell-tortur'd soul, rung through mine ears
Nothing but horrid shrieks, nothing but death?
Whilst I, vailing my knees to the cold earth . . . (198-201)

I see him live, and lives (I hope) to see
Unnumber'd years to guide this empery (210, 211)

Shall they thus tread thee down, which once were glad
To lacquey by thy conquering chariot wheels? (I.iv)

Why stares this devil thus, as if pale death
Had made his eyes the dreadful messengers
To carry black destruction to the world? (II. i. p. 113)

Laugh'st thou, base slave! the wrinkles of that scorn
Thine own heart's blood shall fill. (p. 115)

Murder, now ride in triumph. (II. iii. p. 124)

and ere the hand of death
Should suck (sack?) this ivory palace of thy life (II. vi. p. 131)

Lust's Dominion contains many eloquent speeches and some fine scenes, of which the best are I. ii, II. i, II. v, III. iv, III. vi, and V.i. The last is a great scene, full of the most admirable suspense and dramatic irony. Eleazar's six-fold repetition of the Cardinal's line, 'Spaniard or Moor, the saucy slave shall die,' is remarkably effective. The frequent reminiscences of Marlowe here as elsewhere are in general, however, not such as to suggest his authorship. For example, Eleazar's third speech in V. i is not at all in Marlowe's style. Out of twenty-nine lines, twelve have a distinct run-on movement, and eight rime. Of the twenty-two lines of the Queen-

Mother's speech in I.i six run-on and six rime. The scene which it is most easy to imagine Marlowe to have written is II. i. The speeches in this scene, particularly those of Mendoza, do have the genuine ring. Of 105 lines, ten here rime and twenty run on.

Marlowe's authorship of *Lust's Dominion* was hardly questioned before the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Malone in a note on *King John* V.vii.37 (Malone's Shakespeare, 1790, iv. p. 567) cites parallels from *Tamburlaine* and *Lust's Dominion*, assuming both to be by Marlowe. The *Biographia Dramatica* ascribes it unquestioningly to him. Thomas Campbell in the notice preceding his selection from Marlowe in *Specimens of the British Poets*, 1819 (ii. 160 f.) comments at large on 'Marlowe's tragedy of "Lust's Dominion."' Hazlitt in the second lecture of his *Literature of the Age of Elizabeth* (1820) quotes numerous extracts from this play which he takes to be particularly characteristic of Marlowe. The author of the preface to the Singer reprint of *Hero and Leander* in 1821 claims *Lust's Dominion* as genuine, though rejecting *Tamburlaine*; and Robinson, the editor of the 1826 edition of the poet takes a like position.

In 1825, in the prefatory note to his edition of *Edward II* (Collier's Dodsley ii. 311 f.) J. P. Collier first called attention to the two pieces of external evidence which tend to discredit Kirkman's ascription of *Lust's Dominion* to Marlowe. He noted that the King Philip who dies in the third scene of Act I is Philip II of Spain, whose death (Sept. 13, 1598) followed that of Marlowe by over five years, and that the scene in question contains several unquestionable parallels in wording with an English pamphlet published in 1599.¹⁶

¹⁶ 'A briefe and true Declaration of the Sicknesse, last Wordes, and Death of the King of Spaine, Philip, the Second of that Name; who died in his Abbey of S. Laurence at Escuriall, seven Miles from Madrill, the Thirteenth of September, 1598 . . . 1599.' See the 1809 edition of the *Harleian Miscellany*, ii. 395-7.

In the second place, Collier called attention to a payment of £3 made by Henslowe on February 13, 1600 to Thomas Dekker, William Haughton, and John Day for 'a book called the Spanish Moor's Tragedy.'¹⁷ The title of this play suits the subject of *Lust's Dominion* so well, and the date accords so admirably with the employment of the pamphlet of 1599, that Collier believed the question of the play's authorship to be finally settled. His arguments were accepted with little question by Dyce, Fleay, Ward, and Bullen. In fact *Lust's Dominion* has found a place in no edition of Marlowe since that of Robinson.

The ascription of the play in its present form to Dekker, Haughton, and Day agrees well with the metrical evidence. Plays known to have been written by these authors about the year 1600 show frequent rimes and hemistichs,¹⁸ and in other regards tend to justify Collier's identification.

That Day wrote the curious episode of Oberon and the Fairies at the close of III. ii (which can hardly be imagined to have antedated *A Midsummer Night's Dream*) is evident—as Fleay and Greg have remarked—from its similarity to the Oberon passage at the end of *The Parliament of Bees* (Characters xi and xii), where similarly riming tetrameter verse is substituted for pentameter. The tetrameter speeches of the friars in II. iii and iv very likely point likewise to Day. Fleay assigned III. i-iv and IV to Day; II. ii-v and III. v-vi to Haughton; I, II. i, and V to Dekker. Greg writes that 'III. i-iv are certainly by one hand (? Day's) and II. iii-iv by another (? Haughton's), and the rest may be by one hand (? Dekker's), though this is doubtful.'¹⁹ Such efforts to

¹⁷ *Henslowe's Diary* F 67^v (ed. Greg, p. 118): 'Layd out for the company the 13 of febrearye 1599 (1600) for a boocke called the spaneshe mores tragedie vnto thomas deckers wm harton John daye in pte of payment the some of . . . iij¹¹.'

¹⁸ Day's *Parliament of Bees* is entirely in rime. Day's *Humour out of Breath*, Haughton's *Englishmen for my Money*, and Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* and *Shoemaker's Holiday* contain large blocks of riming verse. All contain frequent hemistichs.

¹⁹ *Henslowe's Diary* ii. 211.

partition the play are of very dubious value, for though there is a considerable disparity in literary worth—Acts I and IV being on the whole a good deal poorer than the others—the scenes are well pieced together and the plot is coherent. The play appears to be the result of genuine collaboration, not a conglomerate of three styles.

Notwithstanding a very general disposition to assign at least the lion's share in *Lust's Dominion* to Dekker, Haughton, and Day, some distinguished critics have been unwilling to renounce wholly the idea of Marlowe's connection with the play. Swinburne wrote in a letter to Bullen (Jan. 14, 1885): 'Even if I did not differ *toto caelo* from your estimate of its merit [that of Horne's *Death of Marlowe*], I should no less feel bound to protest against the introduction of his play into an appendix which might have been made more valuable by a reprint such as you would have given (for the first time) of the hitherto worse than unedited *Lust's Dominion*—which, though of course spurious (at least as it now stands) in the main, has things in it well worthy of Marlowe, and so much in his style that they might reasonably be taken for parts of an unfinished or remodelled Play originally (if but partially) from his hand. The impossibility of his authorship applies only to certain passages which we know he could not have written, and which may well have been added to his manuscript by Dekker, Haughton, or Day.'²⁰

Greg remarks: 'There is certainly a good deal that is Marlowan and which sorts ill with the date of *The Spanish*

²⁰ In reference to a reply by Bullen, Swinburne writes (Jan. 19, 1885): 'I dare say you are right about the authorship of *Lust's Dominion*. I took its identity with *The Spanish Moor's Tragedy* on trust from Dyce and Collier. But I think it deserves a decently careful edition.' I do not know upon what grounds Bullen may have discredited the identification of the two plays. Mr. J. LeGay Brereton writes (private letter, 1909): 'There's not a trace of Marlowe's hand in it, tho' it shows Marlovian influence in structure, characterisation and style. Collier and his followers identified it with *The Spanish Moor's Tragedy* on insufficient evidence; but further study convinces me that they are right. Dekker wrote the greater part of the piece.'

Moor's Tragedy.' Fleay and Ward also hold the view that the Marlovian groundwork of the piece is still recognizable.

Along with the traces of Marlowe, there is, it seems to me, in *Lust's Dominion* evidence of the style, possibly of the actual workmanship, of Thomas Kyd. The gruesome complexity of horror at the close (mitigated perhaps by the revisers into an unsatisfactory 'happy' ending); the notable tendency to moral epigram;²¹ the similarity of the rôles of Zarack and Balthazar to those of Pedringano and Cerberine in *The Spanish Tragedy*; perhaps also the interest in wars of Spain and Portugal, suggest Kyd much more than any of the authors hitherto associated with the play. There is a good deal in *Lust's Dominion* to support the fancy that the tragedy may have had its inception in 1591, when Marlowe and Kyd were by the latter's testimony 'wrytinge in one chamber.'

11 *Dialogue in Verse*

A dramatic dialogue or 'jig,' preserved in a manuscript at Dulwich (Henslowe Papers f. 272), was first printed by Collier on page 8 of his *Alleyn Papers*. It consists of a single page of writing, all but the last eight lines being run together as if prose. On the back of the sheet is written 'Kitt Marlowe' in what Warner (Dulwich Catalogue) characterizes as 'a later, and perhaps modern, hand.'²² Dyce reprinted, without much belief in its genuineness, this bit of doggerel, 'which, mean as it is, I have not chosen to exclude,' throwing out the suggestion that it may possibly be a portion of the lost comedy of *The Maiden's Holiday*, ascribed to Marlowe and Day.

That the lines in question were written by Marlowe is thoroughly improbable. They are, however, an interesting relic of the 'jig' type of drama, and as such were produced

²¹ *E.g.*,
 Tyrants swim safest in a crimson flood
 True misery loves a companion well
 In extremities choose out the least

²² Collier also admitted that the endorsed name is 'in a more modern hand.'

on the stage at Chicago University in 1916, in an entertainment illustrative of various phases in the evolution of English drama. Professor C. R. Baskervill of that university has favored me with the following remarks concerning the piece: 'Though I did not take the fact into account in producing the verses, they may have come from the body of a play as Dyce suggests, for the last lines are couplets. But the context shows that the verses must have been accompanied with dance, and there is little doubt that they were written to be sung, so that the piece seems to be a dramatic jig, whether performed at the end of a play or not. It seems to belong to a type of jig that developed out of folklore. A group of rival suitors of varied callings and social ranks is found in the *Revesby* play printed by Manly and in the various ploughboy plays of Lincolnshire. In these the clown is the victor in the contest. The one early representative of the type is the scene in the *Induction to Lindsay's Satire of the Three Estates* (Bannatyne MS.) where a farcical use of the material for an intrigue appears. The same grouping of four or five wooers with the success of the clown is here. One ballad entered on the Stationers' Register, Aug. 13, 1591, must have been a jig and closely related to Marlowe's specimen: "A new northerne Dialogue betwene Will, Sone, and the warriner, and howe Reynold Peares gott faire Nanye to his Loue." It was in this year that the ballad dialogues began to be entered with the additional designation of "jig." One of the earliest, probably carried to Germany by Kemp where it had a great vogue (see Bolte, *Die Singspiele d engl. Kom.*), was "Rowland and the Sexton," entered Dec. 16, 1591. This is preserved in a German form as published in Keller's *Fastnachtspiele*, II. 1021-1025. Here the rival suitors appear, but both are clowns and the farce interest is developing, or has already developed. At any rate it is seen in *Rowlande's Godsonne* and *Attowels Jigge* (both in Clark's *Sherburn Ballads*). . . .'

B. NON-DRAMATIC SPURIA OR LOST WORKS

1. *Coluthus*

A manuscript note by the antiquary Coxeter stated that Marlowe translated Coluthus's *Rape of Helen* into English rime in 1587. The assertion is repeated, on Coxeter's authority, by Warton in his *History of English Poetry*, and by Malone (MS. note prefixed to *Dido*, Malone 133). Nothing whatever is known of this work. Warton suggested that the version of Coluthus 'was probably brought into vogue, and suggested to Marlowe's notice, by being paraphrased in Latin verse the preceding year by Thomas Watson.'²³

2. *Dedication of Watson's Amintae Gaudia*

A collection of original Latin verse by Thomas Watson published in 1592 is preceded by a Latin dedication addressed to the Countess of Pembroke and signed: 'Honoris tui studiosissimus, C. M.' The initials have been conjecturally expanded into 'Christopher Marlowe' in the catalogue of the John Rylands Library. There is small reason to suppose that Marlowe ever belonged to the Countess of Pembroke's circle.

3. *Manwood Epitaph*

In a note appended to his *History of the English Stage to the Time of Shakespeare* (Collier's Shakespeare, 1844, vol. i. p. xliv), J. P. Collier inserted the following information:

²³ Malone has the note: 'In 1595 was entered by R. Jones (his printer) "a booke entituled *Raptus Helenae*, Helen's Rape, by the Athenian Duke Theseus." The same had been paraphrased in Latin Verse by T. Watson in 1586—in wch. year it was printed in 8^o.' Warton similarly confounds with Coluthus's poem on Helen and Paris the clearly different work on Helen and Theseus; and is rebuked by Dyce. In fact the Stationers' entry of 1595 relates to a poem by John Trussell, of which the only known copy was lately in the Britwell library: '*Raptus Helenae*. The first Rape of faire Hellen. Done into a Poeme by I. T. Imprinted at London by Richard Iohnes, at the signe of the Rose and Crowne . . . Holborne. 1595.' (Cf. Hazlitt's Handbook, p. 616.)

English translations of Coluthus were later made by Sir Edward Sherburne (1618-1702) and by Francis Fawkes (1720-1777).

'In a manuscript note of the time, in a copy of his version of "Hero and Leander," edit. 1629, in our possession, it is said, among other things, that "Marlowe's father was a shoemaker at Canterbury," and that he had an acquaintance at Dover whom he infected with the extreme liberality of his opinions on matters of religion. At the back of the title-page of the same volume is inserted the following epitaph, subscribed with Marlowe's name, and no doubt of his composition, although never before noticed:

"In obitum honoratissimi viri
ROGERI MANWOOD, Militis, Quaestorii
Reginalis Capitalis Baronis.

Noctivagi terror, ganeonis triste flagellum,
Et Jovis Alcides, rigido vulturque latroni,
Urnâ subtegitur: scelerum gaudete nepotes.
Insons, luctifica sparsis cervice capillis,
Plange, fori lumen, venerandae gloria legis
Occidit: heu! secum effoetas Acherontis ad oras
Multa abiit virtus. Pro tot virtutibus uni,
Livor, parce viro: non audacissimus esto
Illius in cineres, cujus tot millia vultus
Mortalium attonuit: sic cum te nuncia Ditis
Vulneret exanguis, feliciter ossa quiescant,
Famaeque marmorei superet monumenta sepulchri."

'It is added, that "Marlowe was a rare scholar, and died aged about thirty." The above is the only extant specimen of his Latin composition, and we insert it exactly as it stands in manuscript.'

Dyce accepted the twelve hexameters as one of the latest writings of Marlowe (Sir Roger Manwood, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, died December 14, 1592); and he offered the suggestion, not supported by what has since been learned of the circumstances of Marlowe's career at Cambridge, that the poet's education at the university may have been due to Manwood's liberality.

It is not clear whether Dyce himself examined the manuscript insertions in Collier's copy of *Hero and Leander*, or whether, as seems more probable from what he says, he

made use simply of Collier's transcript of them.²⁴ No later student appears to have seen the volume, which is now, unfortunately, inaccessible. This being the case, it is impossible to say how seriously Collier's statement that the epitaph is 'subscribed with Marlowe's name' should be taken. Even if altogether *bona fide*, this evidence for Marlowe's authorship cannot of course date earlier than 1629, and presumably not earlier than Feb. 10, 1640, which is the date affixed to the other manuscript notes quoted by Dyce. It is hard, however, not to suspect bad faith. The manuscript writer, as originally quoted by Collier, says: 'Marlowe was a rare scholar, and died aged about thirty.' In the version which Dyce received, he says: 'Hee was a rare scholar, and made excellent verses in Latine. Hee died aged about 30.' It looks as if the additional statement, which I have italicized, may have been concocted to give plausibility to the ascription of the epitaph. The subject matter of the verses in question, which praise Manwood as the stern upholder of law and order, has nothing in common with Marlowe's habitual manner of thinking, and does not suggest the authorship of a poet.

The presence of the epitaph in a copy of *Hero and Leander* can be most naturally explained in a way which does not at all connect it with either of the authors of that poem. Complimentary dedicatory epistles to Sir Thomas Walsingham and to his wife are printed in the book. Their son, Sir Thomas Walsingham (who died in 1669), married as his first wife Elizabeth, granddaughter of the Sir Roger Manwood celebrated in the epitaph.²⁵ If the quarto was in the possession of the Walsingham family at about the period of the civil wars, it may easily have occurred to some member of it to add this eulogy of one Elizabethan ancestor to those of two others which the volume contained.

²⁴ Note Dyce's acknowledgement of Collier's assistance in his Preface to the edition of 1850.

²⁵ Dyce (p. xiii. note †.) erroneously states that Elizabeth Manwood married the elder Sir Thomas Walsingham, Marlowe's friend.

4. *Infortunatus Ch. M.*

Certain manuscript poems signed in this way are mentioned in *Notes and Queries*, Ist. Series, i. 469 (May 18, 1850). I do not know where the manuscript in question now is. The specimen lines printed by no means suggest Marlowe.

TUCKER BROOKE

